



Valérie Devon

Presents

Vincent Reynouard editorials

A public debate for Professor Faurisson.
Repeal of the Gayssot Act

Sans Concession tv
Editorials tv

October 1946 (**TMI, vol.I, judgment,p.263-264**), the Nuremberg Tribunal declares the National Socialist leaders guilty of the extermination of Jews. The judges invoke the confession of the first Auschwitz commander, who confessed mass gassings. 2.5 million exterminated until December 1, 1943 in his camp.

During the trial (**TMI, vol.I, p.50**), some defendants objected the facts, arguing that there was no hard evidence of such a massacre.

Called as a witness (**TMI, vol.I, p.59**), the former head of the Reich Chancellery claimed that Himmler always spoke to him of expulsions, and that until the end, he knew nothing of a massacre of 5 million people.

As for Julius Streicher (**TMI, vol.II, p.381**), he points out that technically, such mass murder would have been impossible to perpetuate.

It is true that to achieve such a mass murder, the Germans would have developed an unprecedented system in history: the homicidal gas chamber for 1,000 or 2,000 people at a time. A room in which they used an extremely dangerous gas: hydrocyanic acid such a facility can not be improvised, many technical problems arise, not only to ensure good distribution of the gas, prevent its absorption on the surfaces, but especially during ventilation of the room, in order to extract the corpses.

Besides, the Soviet accusation asserts (**TMI, vol.VII, p.444**): to develop this unprecedented massacre, perpetrated with this unprecedented weapon, the collaboration of technicians from various disciplines would have been necessary. This collaboration must have inevitably left paper trails.

But, these traces, the Soviets have them in their hands. Because, when they liberated Auschwitz camp, on January 18, 1945 they discovered plans of the crematoria. These plans were shown in their documentary filmed in spring 1945.

But, a few months later, during Nuremberg trials, whereas they exhibited many pictures of Auschwitz taken at the time of the camp's liberation, they did not exhibit a single image of these plans. When it's the murder weapon. An unprecedented weapon. A weapon which would confirm the Nazi's perversion.

Why this incomprehensible discretion? The explanation probably lies in Dachau.

Spring 1945, the victors show people the homicidal gas chamber in Dachau. But it was a propaganda lie, and the Americans noticed it. So much so that, in November 1945, during the Dachau Garrison trial, the general prosecutor abandoned all accusations relating to a gas chamber, and was especially careful not to produce the plan of this gas chamber, as the Americans had drawn it.

But, it was precisely at that time, in November 1945, that the great Nuremberg trial started. Therefore, everything leads to the belief that warmed up by the case of Dachau, the Anglo-Americans advised the Soviets not to produce the plans they had seized. But the case doesn't end there.

June 1959, a former lawyer with the US Department of War, confirmed that, there was no gas chamber in Dachau. What was shown as a gas chamber was a banal crematorium. He adds: *"The Soviets claimed that there was a gas chamber at Auschwitz, but, they did not allow the Westerns powers to go investigate on site."*

But, coincidentally, the Soviets also placed the alleged gas chambers next to the crematoriums. So, why would Auschwitz gas chambers would be more reality than those at Dachau's one?

1974, a leaflet published in England, entitled *"Did six million really die?"* The author challenges the generally accepted version of the Holocaust.

At the same time, a French man, Robert Faurisson, professor of literature investigates. He was able to note the enormous complexity of an American gas chamber, in which one prisoner is executed at a time, sometimes two. Then, he questions, how technically these large Auschwitz gas chambers would have worked.

Because, even the greatest historian of genocide (Raul Hilberg) did not worry about this issue. In his book there is no plan or picture, or even explanatory sketches of a single gas chamber.

March 1976, Pr. Faurisson craftily obtained the plans of the crematoria, which the Auschwitz Museum authorities had been concealing for 31 years, and what a surprise: the rooms presented as *"gas chambers"* are designated, in fact, as *"morgues"*. Which is perfectly normal in a crematorium where one stores the corpses awaiting cremation.

Moreover, according to the Soviet thesis, the Germans would have poured the deadly gas, through 4 holes in the roof. But, apart from the fact that the holes do not appear on the original plans, a Swedish photographer, who took thousands of pictures of the scene in the 70s and 80s, confirms that no such hole is visible in the buildings ruins.

1977, in the United States an academic publishes a complete book that challenges the official version of the Holocaust.

December 1978, Professor Faurisson exposed his findings in an article published by the daily Le Monde. *"For historical and technical reasons"*, he said, *"the German homicidal gas chambers are a mere rumor of war without any further basis in reality."*

February 1979, 34 historians answered him: *"Do not ask how technically such a mass murder was possible, it was technically possible, since it happened. This is the necessary starting point for any historical inquiry on this subject. This truth, it is our role to simply recall it; there is no debate and there can not be any debate on the existence of the gas chambers."*

The same month, in order to make it clear to Mr. Faurisson that there can be no debate, nor even call into doubt publicly the existence of gas chambers, LICRA and other associations brought legal proceeding against the professor. However this modern day-heretic did not bow to such pressure. On the contrary, he responded to those who want him silenced.

And the court case ended when on April 26, 1983, Justice said that in regards to the gas chambers problem: *"the value of the conclusions defended by Mr. Faurisson therefore belongs to the sole appreciation of experts, historians and the public "*

1985, in Canada, a Revisionist, Ernst Zündel, was charged for broadcasting material challenging the reality of the Holocaust. Pr. Faurisson participates in the trial as a defense counsel. The prosecution called the expert number 1 of the Holocaust, Raul Hilberg to testify. But totally defeated by the revisionists, the latter refuses to testify on appeal in 1988.

September 1987, Jean-Marie Le Pen says, awkwardly, that the gas chambers are a point of detail in the Second World War. But, above all he asks: *"are you telling me that it is the whole truth, which everyone has to believe? A moral obligation?"*

December 1987, Pr. Faurisson proposed an open and public debate on the gas chambers issue. He warned that under the pressure from powerful Jewish organizations, the French government was preparing to pass a law that would condemn revisionists to prison, without counting the job losses and being struck off for life.

1988, during the appeal trial of Ernst Zündel, an American citizen who built execution gas chambers in the American penitentiaries was called to testify. He conducted the first comprehensive expertise of the alleged Auschwitz gas chambers. His conclusion was formal, these rooms could not have been used as homicidal gas chambers. In France, the Leuchter report's findings were published. For anti-revisionists, it was urgent to silence Prof. Faurisson and Le Pen. Some tried to deal with this by using violence.

September 1989, Prof. Faurisson is victim of a terrible attack near his home, he owes his life only to the lucky intervention of several people.

July 1990, the anti-revisionist law finally passed. For crimes against humanity, contradicting the judgment of Nuremberg is now punishable by fines and / or imprisonment. Fines can be up to 300,000 francs (45,000 euros), and imprisonment up to one year. This law is unconstitutional, but at the time of its promulgation the initiative was signed by 60 governments representatives But no elected officials -or practically none- dare to act for fear of being accused of defending the infamous. At first, the judges did not dare to enforce the law too harshly, because in the country of human rights throwing someone in prison for his opinions looks rather messy. But the years passed and justice hit harder.

Year 2000, the college professor Jean-Louis Berger was not jailed, but had to pay a heavy fine. Totally ruined and now unemployed with dependent children, he had to ask his mother for his share of the inheritance, so has not to end up on the street. The judgment was reversed thanks to a flaw in the legal procedure saving him just in time. However, brooken by the treatment he received, he died of cancer soon after.

2007, Saverne court condemns me on appeal to one year in prison. The sentence was confirmed on appeal. A year in prison and 20,000 euros fine, not including damages and other costs.

March 2010, a private citizen can now challenge the constitutionality of a law which he or she opposes, by introducing a Priority Question of Constitutionality (QPC). 5 QPC are filed for a review of the anti-revisionist law called Gayssot Act, but the blows miss their target. The 5 QPC are dismissed by the Supreme Court, for lack of seriousness. They are not even transmitted to the Constitutional Council.

July 2010, for the 20th anniversary of the Gayssot Act I am arrested in Belgium where I live, extradited to France and immediately imprisoned in the prison of Valenciennes, to serve out my sentence.

February 2015, I am sentenced to two years in prison, i.e. twice the limit stipulated in the text. In this repressive climate which is accelerating, a totally unknown lawyer contacted me, Lawyer Wilfried Paris, leftist, he proposed to submit a QPC to the anti-revisionist Gayssot Act. I refused at first, then as he insisted, I agreed.

June 2015, Caen Appeal Court sentenced me to one year in prison with no possibility of appeal.

October 2015, the QPC filed on my behalf by Mr. W. Paris, is transmitted to the Constitutional Council.

The rest of the story is well known, four days before the hearing, before the Constitutional Council, Mr. Paris is placed in police custody on trumped-up. The same day, the Constitutional Council sent us each the same letter, stating that Mr. Paris cannot plead, and inviting me to choose another lawyer, which I refused to do.

Fortunately, thanks to his tenacity, Mr Paris managed to get out of this situation, and plead before the Constitutional Council on December 8, 2015. But, exhausted after these unfair attacks, and having been unable to properly prepare himself, the quality of his argument suffered. This is the reason why we will shortly upload the plea which this king of the bar would have made and which he finally recorded.

In December 1987, Professor Faurisson wrote: *"The revisionists simply claim the right to doubt and to research. They do not intend to comply dogma or taboo. They offer an open and public debate."*

This claim was consistent with the education provided to students of the Third Republic, which instructs: *"Freedom to debate is absolute necessity in order to demonstrate the beliefs which are being discussed."* Then one will say, *"Yes, but revisionist theory conveys antisemitism."*

Pardon me, and let me remind that any thesis whatsoever is either true or false. It is this question of truth or falsehood, that must be addressed first, regardless of any other moral or political considerations.

And since before the anti-revisionist law, Justice estimated that the value of the conclusions of Pr. Faurisson fell within the public appreciation, so let's repeal the anti-revisionist Gayssot Act, and let's organize this public debate, which revisionists are calling for almost 30 years.

Good evening.